Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, March 11, 2019

SU 313, 4:00-5:30p

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm

Present: Melissa Anderson, Enrique Chacón, Paul Condon, Carol Ferguson, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Marianne Golding, Justin Harmon, Cynthia Hutton, Dennis Jablonski, Marc Koyack, Laurie Kurutz, Charles Lane, Jesse Longhurst, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

Absent: Brian Fedorek, Chad Thatcher

Guests: Linda Schott, Susan Walsh, Jody Waters, Kristin Hocevar, Dale Vidmar, Lee Ayers, Steve Vincent, John Sollinger, Stuart Janes, John King, Craig Switzler

**0. Chair remarks**

Gay noted that one item was accidentally left off agenda, about new grad proposals; they are in the folder. Send any big questions to Gay so they can be addressed before the next meeting. Gay welcomed Trustee Steve Vincent who was visiting. Also: Thatcher absent, so no video recording of this meeting.

1. **Approval of Minutes from 2/25**
   * Kurutz moved to approve minutes, Lane seconded, no corrections. Chacón, Condon, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Morey, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Yamaguchi voted in favor. None opposed. Anderson, Ferguson, Gay abstained. Yates arrived after voting. **Motion passed.**
2. **President’s Report: Linda Schott**
   * Schott went to Medford Chamber forum, Grand Canyon University is moving into Medford, they want to fly RCC people there; they have a person on the ground forming partnerships etc.; lots of grad and undergraduate programs including digital film; Schott shared this for our awareness
   * Schott was in Salem presenting to legislators in education subcommittee of the ways and means committee. $40 million extra for higher education was proposed by the legislature; remember we need $120 million
   * We presented on what we do with the money they give us (Stone’s faculty/course management), we presented on the reductions we’ve made since 2015; concerns about transparency in general were acknowledged, although the committee said transparency concerns weren’t with us but with the “bigs,” issues with PSU’s president haven’t helped.
   * Schott met with two of the co-chairs Rayfield and Steiner Hayward, and will meet with Betsy Johnson, they believe they are giving us CSL, but whose CSL numbers are those, they are not ours. They don’t understand why our costs are higher than 40 million, their attitude seems to be that we have to get used to dealing with less, so we have a lot of work to do
   * Gay asked why there is such a big discrepancy; Schott and Walsh said that Greg Perkinson could explain it better; it has to do with the way they calculate costs and other things; Schott will get us a better answer
   * Vincent (trustee) said that unfortunately the legislators’ impression of the university goes back 30 years
   * Had a meeting with other TRU schools and legislators, both republicans and democrats were there, discussed impact of high tuition, layoffs, etc.
   * Schott will be on the road next week doing more of this
   * Carol asked where disconnect is coming from, Steiner Hayward is new, and she might just be taking what office gives her, Kotec didn’t seem to know how our funding is calculated; HECC should be communicating this to legislators, we will continue doing best we can
3. **Provost’s Report: Susan Walsh**
   * Walsh said she had nothing to add about budget, it is frustrating; but Retention Summit will be March 14; Retention is one thing we can have an impact on, plan is to tell everyone what we are doing, what programs are working, giving updates, give time for brainstorming; it is important to have new ideas and tried and true things to think about anew
   * Provost Council: Last Tuesday DCin program was unanimously approved; thanks to all who worked on it
4. **AC report/Bylaws Review of Committee on Committees: Marianne Golding**
   * Beginning of next term Committee on Committees (CoC) will meet and put out a new call for people to join committees; it’s a good time to see what C on C should be doing.
   * Charge is in Drive. CoC has not been assigning tasks, and it could be taken amiss. We should change this in bylaws unless that’s really what we want CoC to do. No way for committee to ensure distribution of tasks either. Also schedule is not possible by last meeting of the year, getting it consolidated in summer is best the committee can do.
   * Suggested changes in bylaws: Green = take out yellow = keep
   * Committee chairs wrote up details last year for prospective members, and we can add that to call for next year. Do you want to get a report from every committee? Some we know what they do, some we don’t. Do we want this every term? Also minutes etc., should we make them available? Maybe we should send a survey?
   * Ferguson asked if this about changing the bylaws. Equitable distribution on committees is important, why take it out? Discussion then ensued about what this phase actually means. Golding suggested that sometimes the CoC cannot make the distribution work
   * Yates stated that the first part of the charge bothers him the most; it’s the Senate’s job to give guidance and assign tasks, not the CoC
   * Ferguson asked what “performance” means in the charge and suggested it should come out. Golding said the CoC doesn’t want to be the police; members can email if there is a problem
   * Jablonski suggested other committees could use a Google Drive the way the Senate does
   * Golding asked if these kinds of things should be in bylaws, and Ferguson suggested they could be in the description of committees.
   * Yates suggested that we don’t want to mandate too many things; instead we should have Senate chair give directions to committees
5. **Elections Committee Report: Melissa Anderson**
   * Elections committee has been working on elections for senators, chairs, and Faculty Personnel Committee. The Senate openings are not evenly distributed over three-year periods. The current list with dates of terms is in the Drive; please look at it and make sure it is correct
   * More about Elections and possible bylaw changes in the future
6. **ASSOU Report: Alexis Phillips**
   * No one from ASSOU was in attendance
7. **Grad Council item (accidentally left off agenda)**
   * Stuart Janes present from Environmental Education to answer questions
   * Ferguson already resolved question she had about courses students could take from Biology that were missing from proposal
   * Business program will be coming to a Senate meeting in April to report on what is going on with Online MBA etc. If you have questions, send them to Gay
8. **New University Studies Course Proposals**
   * Ferguson had a question last time about one of the integration courses, COMM 486; Hocevar was amenable to changing language about lower education, lower health literacy in course description, so that question has been resolved
   * Kurutz moved to approve the proposals; Yamaguchi seconded; Anderson, Chacón, Condon, Ferguson, French, Golding, Harmon, Hutton, Jablonski, Koyack, Kurutz, Lane, Longhurst, Morey, Oliveri, Phillips, Siders, Yamaguchi, and Yates voted in favor. None opposed. Gay abstained. **Motion passed.**
9. **Healthcare Administration Program Report**
   * Switzler has put the report in the Senate Drive
   * Oliveri asked when this program was approved; answer is 2 years ago
   * Report shows demographics of students; we have 50 students; that was the target
   * The program has gotten the numbers broken down across classes; SSCs have been very instrumental in helping capture student group; they have identified a core faculty of 7; they meet every term about curricular issues, advising, program issues, etc.
   * Program has made adjustments to overall curriculum, better aligning to SOU faculty, and will be making changes in near future, to better align with outcomes
   * Program just had a successful meeting with community partners, they are very supportive of this program and energetic about being involved, identifying practica, trying to place students, etc.
   * Only major curriculum change is petitioning Bio 102 out for students who already had human anatomy and physiology; Jackie Strenio from Economics added healthcare economics, the program also substituted other classes because there is no one teaching organizational psycholgy.
   * Report has a lot of numbers, but program is hitting its targets; has 91% retention. One student left for the nursing program, one left school entirely, and one left for unknown reasons.
   * Gay asked about numbers; projection is 60 but it looks like the program has 50; King stated that 50 is number for right now, by the end of the year the number should be at 60
   * Ferguson asked about staffing for the program. program? Switzler responded that they ID core faculty, but Craig is coordinating the practica as well as doing other tasks. Ferguson asked if another faculty line will be needed. King answered that they are revisiting the proposal, the description of the program coordinator, and the program needs; they have a budget line to search for a full-time tenure track position, but the current core faculty group will figure out if that’s what is needed; Ferguson asked if it will be a faculty member in Health and PE, and King answered that it wouldn’t necessarily be Health & PE, it will be whatever in whatever area is determined to be needed by the core team.
   * Hocevar offered her perspective on being part of the core faculty; she has “normal” Communication responsibilities, but her courses are required for HCA, so she meets all the HCA students at some time; they are great students, and lots of them are already working in healthcare. The core faculty are all really excited to be a part of the program, but are figuring out how to manage it when they are all in different home departments.
   * Condon also offered his perspective as part of the core faculty. He said they have been having ongoing discussions about the program coordinator, a new hire, and other issues. People from the medical communities in the area are really excited about the program and want to employ our students.
   * Chacón asked if the program had thought about offering more Spanish. Switzler replied that they are starting to talk about it. They are going to work on offering a course on medical terminology first, then working with Spanish in the future
   * Gay asked if King could clarify the coordinator position; King said that when they created the position, they didn’t know who the core faculty would be. Gay clarified that the search will include the coordinator position, they just don’t know what the discipline will be yet.
   * Jablonski asked if anyone was talking to students at Crater since they have a students with a healthcare focus; King noted that there are high school staff in the groups Switzler talks to, as well as other stakeholders; Jablonski wondered how many students come from those pathways, but Switzler wasn’t sure
   * French stated that it should be said that they are doing a great job; King responded that it’s a lot of hard work by Switzler and others
   * Gay asked if there were curricular developments. Switzler says he has been working on a sheet with changes to share that will be going to curriculum next year, but it’s too complicated to put together right now. One option they are exploring is Gerontology/Aging Services, and they will be having a meeting about it next month
   * King noted that Asante has a sponsored a scholarship for the HCA program, and the program is working with other groups for this kind of thing also, it’s an aspect they want to grow
   * Ferguson noted that the sheet had a “certificate only” option and asked if that was correct. Switzler responded that it’s a thought the program has had, but it’s on the back burner for now, it doesn’t exist as an option at this point
10. **Faculty Personnel Committee Report on FPARs**
    * John Sollinger came to Senate but wasn’t at FPC for that discussion
    * FPC Report gave us some things consider; Ferguson stated that the FPC addressed valid points about the deadline review process and gave pros and cons, but did not state what they thought; Gay responded that FPC had a great discussion but did not come to clear conclusions
    * Waters stated that when the issue was brought to Senate before it was because the FPARs were not doing what they were supposed to do; the goal was to figure out what we could do to make them better. Senate decided to get rid of the FPAP and move FPARs to the end of Spring Term.
    * Oliveri stated that for her, this schedule is off cycle due to her specific course assignment. She can update her FPAR, but doesn’t know where that update falls in the process.
    * Gay asked if the date for submission was moved, might it be possible for chairs to get stipends to review them, and Walsh responded that it might be.
    * Ferguson suggested that people in Oliveri’s situation could just include the information in the following year. Waters noted that the FPAR is only one piece of promotion and tenure, there are other evaluative pieces.
    * Golding noted that training was an issue that was brought up as well, and reminded senators that Fedorek volunteered to train everybody
    * Gay noted that Waters and Stanek have handled most of the AI training, and wondered if they had given thought to mentoring; Waters said yes, and noted that mentoring was the appropriate word. The quantity/quality of the FPAR narrative has to do with the orientation toward the process
    * Walsh suggested that it should come from programs, to own this part of professional development, to make it a holistic view looking back at what you are about; programs have a say in whether or not it is perfunctory
    * Longhurst noted that programs could get more guidance on this, and Walsh agreed that would make sense, while pointing out that although she would be happy to support this and help develop it, Faculty Senate governs FPAR guidelines
    * Gay noted that OCA has done some nice things with FPARs. Humphrey makes announcements based on FPAR reading he has done, gives out $25 give cards for most amazing, etc. Gay asked if this gives everyone a sense of why they are important, and Kurutz replied that it does, that the chairs read them and bring up things also, and that it helps to know that all the information isn’t just going into the ether.
    * Yates noted that some people feel do feel that it goes into the ether; some take it seriously and some don’t. If we are serious about this, we need to decide what role it has, and if it is part of post tenure review or not.
    * Walsh noted that directors have ability to give feedback, but don’t have to, whereas chairs have to. She is open to ideas about how to make this a better process, and noted that it was important to her as a faculty member.
11. **Announcements/New Business**
    * Ferguson asked if we were supposed to be getting feedback from our faculty about director concerns [form the report at the last meeting] and Gay responded that yes, we were supposed to be doing that.
    * Nothing else

Meeting adjourned at 5:28